

### REMARKS

Applicant has amended claims 6 and 12 and have canceled claims 7-11, 13 and 14. New claims 15-22 are presented, including new independent claim 20. Support for these amendments is provided in paragraphs [0040], [0045] and [0046] and Figures 6A, 7 and 8 of the published application US 2004/001/0239001.

#### *Claim rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103*

Claims 6-10, 12 and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as allegedly being unpatentable over German DE 202 11 150 to Vohrer. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection in view of the amendments and the following is requested.

The Examiner states that “the sequence of performing process steps has been held to be *prima facie* obvious absent a showing new or unexpected results (MPEP 2144.04 IV C)”.

However, the Examiner has not identified a conduit forming method with **multiple distinct** injection moulding steps which are executed **sequentially**. Vohrer discloses a connector formed from a **single** step injection moulding process where a portion of the material forming the connector penetrates between an inner plastic hose (13) and an outer jacketed metal hose (2). The amended claims now require at least two distinct injection moulding steps which is not disclosed or suggested in Vohrer.

Furthermore, independent claims 6 and 20 include limitations not present in previously presented claim 6, namely:

- the connector be sealed relative to the conduit,
- the soft rubber has a low melting point,

- the hot molten plastic forming the cuff be injected at a temperature greater than the soft rubber forming the cuff,
- the cuff shields the conduit from the hot molten plastic (claim 6), and
- the cuff thermally insulates the conduit from hot molten plastic (claim 20).

Applicant submits that none of these limitations are disclosed or suggested in Vohrer.

Therefore, Applicant submits that Vohrer does not anticipate amended claim 6 and new claim 20. Moreover, Applicant submits that Vohrer cannot be modified to render obvious amended claim 6 and new claim 20. Reconsideration of claim 6 and consideration of new claim 20 is requested. Allowance of claims 6 and 20 is requested.

Claims 12 and 15-19 are dependent upon claim 6 which Applicant submits is allowable over Vohrer. Therefore, Applicant submits that claims 12 and 15-19 are allowable. Claims 21 and 22 are dependent upon claim 20 which Applicant submits is allowable over Vohrer. Therefore, Applicant submits that claims 21 and 22 are allowable. Allowance is requested.

Claims 6-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as allegedly being unpatentable over United States Patent No. 3,963,856 to Carlson et al. in view of United States Patent No. 3,779,846 to Kleykamp et al. and United States Publication No. 2003/0236015 to Edirisuriya et al. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection in view of the amendments and the following is requested.

The Examiner alleges that it would have been *prima facie* obvious to modify the teaching of Carlson with the teaching of Kleykamp and Edirisuriya to arrive at the multiple step method as claimed. The Examiner, however, has not provided an articulation of why one of ordinary skill in the art would combine the teaching of Carlson, Kleykamp and Edirisuriya. Furthermore, it is

not clear how the combined teachings of Carlson, Kleykamp and Edirisuriya could result in the method claimed in independent claims 6 and 20.

None of Carlson, Kleykamp or Edirisuriya disclose or even suggest a multiple step injection moulding method for fabricating a connector on the end of a conduit.

Applicant submits that there is no motivation provided in Carlson, Kleykamp and/or Edirisuriya to modify the respective teachings to result in a multiple-step method. None of Carlson, Kleykamp and/or Edirisuriya suggest using an intervening or intermediate element as a shield or insulator during an injection moulding process.

Therefore, Applicant submits that Carlson, Kleykamp and Edirisuriya does not render obvious amended claim 6 and new claim 20. Reconsideration of claim 6 and consideration of new claim 20 is requested. Allowance of claims 6 and 20 is requested.

Claims 12 and 15-19 are dependent upon claim 6 which Applicant submits is allowable over Carlson, Kleykamp and Edirisuriya. Therefore, Applicant submits that claims 12 and 15-19 are allowable. Claims 21 and 22 are dependent upon claim 20 which Applicant submits is allowable over Carlson, Kleykamp and Edirisuriya. Therefore, Applicant submits that claims 21 and 22 are allowable. Allowance is requested.


A Request for a One-Month Extension of Time to extend the date for response up to and including April 3, 2009 is concurrently submitted with this Amendment.

Should the Examiner have any questions, the Examiner is invited to contact one of the undersigned attorneys at (312) 704-1890.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: Jan. 27, 2009

By:

  
Raiford A. Blackstone, Jr., Reg. No. 25,156  
Linda L. Palomar, Reg. No. 37,903

TREXLER, BUSHNELL, GIANGIORGI  
BLACKSTONE & MARR, LTD.  
105 W. Adams Street  
Suite 3600  
Chicago, Illinois 60603  
(312) 704-1890

AB0841.WPD